## RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 3 1 2005

Application/Control Number: 10/064,478

Title: AVS Liquid Feed Terminal

Art Unit: 1724

20

Page 1 of 8
Applicant: POWELL, ET AL,
Attorney Docket No. 02-RIC-02

1 IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND 2 TRADEMARK OFFICE 3 In re the Application of Art Unit: 1724 4 James R. Powell and Morris Reich Examiner: Robert J. Popovics Attorney Docket No.: 02-RIC-02 5 Application/Control Number: 10/064,478 6 Title: AVS Liquid Feed Terminal Office Action: March 2, 2005 Filed: July 18, 2004 7 Reply Due: June 2, 2005 For: Apparatus and Process of Using 10 Commissioner for Patents Date of Reply: May 31, 2005 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 11 12 Sir: Applicant's Reply to USPTO Rejection/Objection 13 14 Amendment to the Claims CLAIM REJECTION: ANTICIPATION. The USPTO office action rejects claims 15 16 1-4, 11-15 and 17-20 based on anticipation by Lee (US 5,874,006, citing the endplates (24) and (25). The remainder of the claims are objected to as depending from rejected 17 18 claims, but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form. 19 INTERVIEW SUMMARY. Applicant's attorney, Louis Ventre, Jr., held an

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

Interview with Examiner Robert J. Popovics on March 9, 2005 and reviewed all of the

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (703-872-9306) on May 31, 2005.

Louis ventre, Jr.

Application/Control Number: 10/064,478

Title: AVS Liquid Feed Terminal

Art Unit: 1724

Page 2 of 8 Applicant: POWELL, ET AL. Attorney Docket No. 02-RIC-02

- 1 claims, the operation of the invention and the outstanding Office Action. Applicant's
- 2 Attorney questioned the presence of a "dual-walled" vertical tube in the Lee reference
- 3 (US 5,874,008) cited in the March 2, 2005 Office Action.
- The Examiner indicated that the wall (52) illustrated in Figure 2, was seen to
- 5 meet this limitation, with the upper portion of that wall not being porous and the lower
- 6 portion being porous. The Examiner suggested limiting the claim to a vitrification
- 7 system / environment to overcome the rejection of Lee under section 102.
- 8 Applicant's attorney observed that this element (52) also had a non-porous
- 9 bottom segment. Because the element (52) has three walls it is not the same as
- 10 applicant's dual walled tube.
- 11 "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is
- 12 found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." See
- 13 MPEP §2131 (citations omitted).
- 14 Thus, the cited reference is inapplicable and Applicant requests that the rejection
- 15 be withdrawn based on this difference in the elements. Withdrawal of the rejection is
- 16 considered important and relevant based on the Festo decision and Applicant's desire
- 17 and intention to retain protection of equivalents to Applicant's invention.
- At the interview, Applicant's attorney indicated an intention to propose an
- 19 amendment incorporating the recommended limitation in the preamble. Applicant
- 20 believes an amendment to the preamble of the base claim is appropriate,
- 21 notwithstanding the anticipated withdrawal of the anticipation rejection. Applicant freely

Application/Control Number: 10/064,478

Title: AVS Liquid Feed Terminal

Art Unit: 1724

Page 3 of 8 Applicant: POWELL, ET AL. Attorney Docket No. 02-RIC-02

- 1 requests such amendment not for the purpose of overcoming the rejection or for
- 2 purposes of patentability, but only because the claims after amendment more
- 3 accurately describe applicant's invention. Accordingly, in addition to Applicant's request
- 4 for withdrawal of the rejection, Applicant also requests amendment to the claims, as
- 5 attached hereto.
- 6 Examiner noted error in the Loshe patent citation in the IDS. Applicant's
- 7 attorney noted a prior communication to Examiner Popovics on July 28, 2004 correcting
- 8 the patent number and date shown in the IDS for the Loshe patent to patent number
- 9 6,352,159 granted on March 5, 2002. Applicant's attorney acknowledged that a revised
- 10 IDS should have been submitted and now requests that the Loshe patent be
- 11 considered.
- 12 CONCLUSION ON REJECTION. The anticipation rejection, based on a
- 13 reference that is not identical in each and every element of Applicant's invention, should
- 14 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicant requests amendment of the base claim to
- 15 reference the field of vitrification in the preamble, as was suggested to clarify the
- 16 intended field of the invention.
- 17 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. The Office Action notes that the
- 18 patents cited in the specification were not in an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)
- 19 and will not be considered. Attached to the Office Action was the IDS with a line
- 20 through the Loshe patent indicating that it was not considered.
- 21 IDS RESPONSE. Applicant acknowledges and accepts that the patents cited in

Application/Control Number: 10/064,478

Title: AVS Liquid Feed Terminal

Art Unit: 1724

Page 4 of 8 Applicant: POWELL, ET AL. Attorney Docket No. 02-RIC-02

- 1 the specification were not in the Information Disclosure Statement and will not be
- 2 considered. The patents cited in the specification are for background discussion.
- 3 Applicant's timely submitted IDS listed patents submitted for consideration by the
- 4 Office.
- 5 ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER. The Office Action mentions that Claims 5-
- 6 10, 16 and 21 are objectionable because they depend from a rejected base claim. The
- 7 Office Action states that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.
- 8 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE ON ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER. Applicant
- 9 notes that the grounds for rejecting the base claim have been overcome and the
- 10 rejection should be withdrawn. Applicant also notes that the proposed amendment to
- 11 the preamble of the base claim clarifies the intended field of the invention. Therefore,
- 12 applicant observes that the grounds for the objection have been removed, the amended
- 13 claims better describe Applicant's invention, and the amended claims should be
- 14 allowable.